

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesy extended to the Applicants' representative at the Interview of February 22, 2008.

This Amendment is submitted in view of the interview, taking into account the suggestions made by the Examiner.

### **I. Status of Claims**

Claims 1-19 are currently pending in the application. This Amendment amends claims 1, 6, 12 and 15, and addresses each point of rejection raised by the Examiner. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

### **II. Rejections of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 1, 5-6, 10, 12, 14-15 and 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Nishikawa et al. ("Nishikawa"), U.S. Patent No. 6,507,411, in view of Edelson, U.S. Patent No. 5,774,110.

Claims 2-4, 7-9, 11, 13 and 16-18 have been have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Nishikawa, in view of Edelson, in further view of Ishizaka et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0052662.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections because Nishikawa, in view of Edelson, does not disclose, teach, suggest or render obvious each and every feature of the recited claims. In particular, starting with independent claim 1, the amended claim recites:

A method of enlarging an image and printing an enlarged image, the method comprising:

identifying an image file having an image to be enlarged and printed;  
determining the number of pixels of the image using the identified image file;  
determining an enlargement ratio corresponding to the determined number of pixels to print without degrading image resolution quality; and  
enlarging the image at the determined enlargement ratio and printing the enlarged image.

Applicants respectfully submit that Nishikawa, in view of Edelson, does not render obvious the recited claim feature of “determining an enlargement ratio corresponding to the determined number of pixels to print without degrading image resolution quality; and enlarging the image at the determined enlargement ratio and printing the enlarged image”.

Examiner admits that Nishikawa does not disclose “determining an enlargement ratio corresponding to the determined number of pixels to print without degrading image quality”. The Examiner alleges that Edelson cures the deficiencies of Nishikawa. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Edelson merely discloses a RAMDAC as a graphics card that converts a digital image into an analog image. The RAMDAC only determines size of the analog image corresponding to resolution of the monitor and *displays the resized analog image on the monitor*.

However, independent claim 1 recites “determining an enlargement ratio corresponding to the determined number of pixels to print without degrading image resolution quality; and enlarging the image at the determined enlargement ratio and printing the enlarged image”. Edelson merely teaches displaying an analog image on

a monitor according to the resolution of the monitor, and does not disclose printing an image without degrading the image resolution quality.

Thus, the combination of Nishikawa and Edelson fails to teach each limitation of independent claim 1, or to even suggest each limitation. Nor would there be any apparent reason to combine Nishikawa and Edelson. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 is patentable over the applied art.

Independent claims 6, 12 and 15 recite similar subject matter to that of independent claim 1 and are therefore distinguished from Nishikawa and Edelson for reasons similar to those given above.

Dependent claims 2-5, 7-11, 13, 14 and 16-19 are distinguished from the cited references for at least the reasons given above by virtue of their dependence on independent claims 1, 6, 12 and 15, respectively. Moreover, a thorough review of Ishizaka shows that Ishizaka also fails to cure the deficiencies of Nishikawa and Edelson.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections of claims 1- 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

**III. Conclusion**

In view of the above, it is believed that the above-identified application is in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully Submitted,



---

Paul H. Nguyen-Ba  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 60,742

Roylance, Abrams, Berdo & Goodman, L.L.P.  
1300 19<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W., Suite 600  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
(202) 659-9076

Dated: February 26, 2008